

## ATTITUDE OF ADOLESCENTS TOWARDS MODERNIZATION- A COMPARATIVE STUDY

PINKI NINANIYA<sup>1</sup>, SANTOSH SANGWAN<sup>2</sup>, REENA<sup>3</sup> & SHANTI BALDA<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,3</sup>Research Scholar, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, COHS CCS Haryana  
Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana, India

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, COHS CCS Haryana  
Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana, India

<sup>4</sup>Professor Department of Human Development and Family Studies, COHS CCS Haryana  
Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana, India

### ABSTRACT

*Modernization refers to an evolutionary model of transforming traditional society to a modern society. Modernization is the process by which cultures are forced to accept threats from outside, and change their original shape. The present study was carried out in Hisar district of Haryana state. The current study examined attitudes of adolescents towards modernization in a sample of 200 adolescents between the age group of 16-17 years. Comprehensive Modernization Inventory developed by Ahluwalia and Kalia (1998) was used to assess the attitude of adolescents towards modernization. The results of the study pinpointed that urban respondents had more positive attitudes on education, parent child relationship, politics and the status of women aspects of modernization as compared to their counterparts. Mean comparison revealed that urban respondents are more positive towards education (M=28.47), P-C relationship (M=25.09) and status of women (M=22.26) as compared to rural respondents (M=26.20, M=23.54 M=20.91 respectively).*

**KEYWORDS:** Modernization, Adolescents, Rural & Urban

**Received:** Apr 02, 2017; **Accepted:** Apr 19, 2017; **Published:** May 03, 2017; **Paper Id.:** IJESRJUN20174

### INTRODUCTION

We live in a changing world and change is the law of nature. This change is taking place through various means of industrialization, urbanization, westernization, democracy and civilization called modernization. Modernization is the process of social transition, which includes not only modernization of social objects, but also that of social subjects. The modernization of social objects – which means democratization in politics, industrialization of agriculture, multiplicity in culture and internationalization in education and so on – reflects an overall transformation of social politics, economy, culture, and education soon. The modernization of social subjects – which means the modernization of people's thoughts, opinions, attitudes and behavior – reflects the individual modernization or individual modernity.

According to Havilland (2002) modernization is defined as an all-encompassing global process of cultural and Socio- economic changes, whereby the developing societies seek to acquire some of the characteristics common to industrial Societies. In the course of modernization, traditional knowledge and techniques give way to the application of scientific knowledge borrowed mainly from the West. Alka Chaudhary, 2015 Modernization is a

process by which modern scientific knowledge covering all aspects of human life is introduced at varying degree, first in western civilization and later diffused to the non-western world by different methods & group with the ultimate purpose of achieving a better & non satisfactory life in the broadest sense of the term, as accepted by the society concerned. Due to modern technology, modernization creates the change in traditions and values. People are going to accept this because progress is both necessary and beneficial to society and the individual (Kragh and Djusaa, 2006). Mobility chances depend on the opportunity structure, i.e. the social structure of society, and if industrialization changes the occupational structure it will also affect total mobility. The new economy did not only change mobility patterns via changes of the class structure, but also through changing mechanisms of socioeconomic attainment. The social bottlenecks which act as impediments to development are insufficient attitudinal modernization and a markedly dualistic structure of society. The absence of a sizeable indigenous middle class, low levels of secondary education and literacy, and inadequate social mobility also constitute important obstacles to raising capacity for long term growth. The present study, therefore, was planned with an objective to study the attitude of adolescents towards modernization.

## **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

For the present study Hisar city of Haryana state was purposively selected. A list of villages having Senior Secondary Schools was procured from the Education Department of Hisar District. From the list two villages i.e. Arya Nagar from block Hisar I and Dabra from block Hisar II were selected randomly to represent the rural sample. Further two government schools, one each from selected villages were taken randomly to draw the rural sample and similar procedure was followed for urban sample. Two schools, namely Campus Senior Secondary School and Thakur Das Bhargava Senior Secondary School, Hisar were selected randomly for urban sample. Therefore, from all the selected four schools, two each from urban and rural area, a list of children falling in the age group 16-18 years from class 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> was prepared separately. From each school, 50 adolescents were selected on a random basis. Hence, a total of 200 adolescents (100 rural and 100 urban), from four schools constituted the sample for the present investigation.

The data were collected personally on an individual basis with the help of a self prepared questionnaire for personal and socioeconomic information of the respondents. The class teachers of selected class from different schools were given prior information for the data and time of visit. The importance and objective of the study were explicitly explained to the respondents. The respondents were asked to read the questionnaire carefully before filling it.

Modernizing Inventory for adolescent, developed by Ahluwalia and Kalia (1998) was used to measure modernization and its seven aspects, i.e. education, parent-Child Relationship, politics, the status of women, marriage, religion and socio-cultural factor. This includes both positive as well as negative items and scored as extremely agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly, disagree. The maximum score for positive item is awarded is 5 and least is 1. In case of negative items the scoring procedure is to be reversed.

Qualitative data obtained from the measure were quantified and analyzed using the statistical package for the social science.

## **RESULTS**

### **Personal Profile of Respondents**

Table 1 displayed that out of the total sample majority of the respondents (80%) were in the age range of 16-17 years followed by 17-18 years age. Data related to the birth order indicated that out of the total sample maximum number

of respondents had 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> (84.0%) birth order followed by 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> (16%) birth order. A similar trend was followed for both rural and urban areas separately. Regarding academic achievement of the respondents' data in table depicted that out of the total sample half of respondents had 2<sup>nd</sup> division followed by 1<sup>st</sup> division (38%) and 3<sup>rd</sup> division (12%). Comparatively more number of urban respondents (40%) had 1<sup>st</sup> division than rural respondents (36%) and an equal number of percentages had 2<sup>nd</sup> division in both rural and urban areas.

**Table 1: Personal Profile of Respondents on the Basis of Area**

Sr No.	Personal Variables	Rural N=100	Urban N=100	Total N=200
<b>1</b>	<b>Age</b>			
	16 -17 years	81 (81.0)	79 (79.0)	160 (80.0)
	17-18 years	19 (19.0)	21 (21.0)	40 (20.0)
<b>2</b>	<b>Birth order</b>			
	1 <sup>st</sup> -2 <sup>nd</sup> born	82 (82.0)	86 (86.0)	168 (84.0)
	3 <sup>rd</sup> - 4 <sup>th</sup> born	18 (18.0)	14 (14.0)	32 (16.0)
<b>3</b>	<b>Academic achievement</b>			
	1 <sup>st</sup> division	36 (36.0)	40 (40.0)	76 (38.0)
	2 <sup>nd</sup> division	50 (50.0)	50 (50.0)	100 (50.0)
	3 <sup>rd</sup> division	14 (14.0)	10 (10.0)	24 (12.0)

Note: Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

### Parental Profile of Respondents

Parental profile of respondents displayed in table 2 the data on paternal age distribution highlights that the majority of fathers were in the age range of 35-45 years from both rural (81.0%) and urban area (70.0%). The trend for distribution of fathers for their age was same for total sample also. Regarding the distribution of mothers for their age table 4 depicts that highest percentage of mothers from rural, urban and total sample (80.0%, 72.0% and 76%) were in the age range of 30-40 years against minimum percentages of highest age group *i.e.* 40-50 years.

Paternal education data expressed that the high percentage of fathers were educated below 10<sup>th</sup> in rural area, but in urban area highest percentages of fathers were educated between 10<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> standard. Whereas, in rural and urban area out of the total sample, 18 percent and 4 percent fathers were illiterate respectively. In total, 36 percent fathers were educated between 10<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> standard and almost equal percentage of respondent's fathers was below 10<sup>th</sup> and above 12<sup>th</sup>. Data related to mother's education out of the total sample, 26 percent mothers were illiterate, 33.5 percent were educated below 10<sup>th</sup> followed by 10<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> (27.0%) and above 12<sup>th</sup> standard (13.5%). While comparing data, in rural area 40 percent mothers were educated below 10<sup>th</sup>, and only 4 percent were educated above 12<sup>th</sup> standard, but in urban area 31 percent mothers were educated between 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> standard followed by 27 percent between 10<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> pass and 23 percent above 12<sup>th</sup> standard.

Regarding the occupation of the father, the table further highlighted that in rural areas, maximum number, 80 percent fathers were engaged in farming followed by 15 percent were engaged in business/ shopkeeper and 5 percent were in service, whereas, in an urban area maximum number of fathers 41 percent of fathers was doing job in different sectors followed by 37 percent and 22 percent were engaged in business/ shopkeeper and in farming respectively. Out of the total sample, 51 per cent fathers were farmers followed by 26 per cent had their own small business/ shopkeeper and 23 per cent were doing job in different sectors. Turning to the data related to mother's occupation, data avowed that that's out of the

total sample, 82 per cent respondent's mothers were housewife followed by equal percentages were engaged in labor/business (9%) and service (9%). While comparing rural and urban respondents, it was noted that the number of urban mothers (16%) were doing job as compared to rural mothers (2%).

**Table 2: Parental Profile of Respondents on the Basis of Area**

Sr. No.	Parental Variables	Rural N= 100	Urban N=100	Total N=200
<b>1</b>	<b>Fathers' age</b>			
	35-45 year	81 (81.0)	70 (70.0)	151 (75.5)
	45 <sup>+</sup> -55year	19 (19.0)	30 (30.0)	49 (24.5)
<b>2</b>	<b>Mother's age</b>			
	30-40 year	80 (80.0)	72 (72.0)	152 (76.0)
	40 <sup>+</sup> -50 year	20 (20.0)	28 (28.0)	48 (24.0)
<b>3</b>	<b>Father's education</b>			
	Illiterate	18 (18.0)	04 (4.0)	22 (11)
	<10 <sup>th</sup>	41 (41.0)	12 (12.0)	53 (26.5)
	10 <sup>th</sup> - 12 <sup>th</sup>	30 (30.0)	43 (43.0)	73 (36.0)
	>12 <sup>th</sup>	11(11.0)	41(41.0)	52 (26.0)
<b>4</b>	<b>Mother's education</b>			
	Illiterate	33 (33.0)	19 (19.0)	52 (26.0)
	< 10 <sup>th</sup>	40 (40.0)	27 (27.0)	67 (33.5)
	10 <sup>th</sup> to 12 <sup>th</sup>	23 (23.0)	31 (31.0)	54 (27.0)
	>12 <sup>th</sup>	4 (4.0)	23 (23.0)	27 (13.5)
<b>5</b>	<b>Father's occupation</b>			
	Farming	80 (80.0)	22 (22.0)	102 (51.0)
	Small business/ Shopkeeper/ Labour	15 (15.0)	37 (37.0)	52 (26.0)
	Service	5 (5.0)	41 (41.0)	46 (23.0)
<b>6</b>	<b>Mother's Occupation</b>			
	Housewife	92 (92.0)	72 (72.0)	164 (82.0)
	Labour/business	6 (6.0)	12 (12.0)	18 (9.0)
	Service	2 (2.0)	16 (16.0)	18 (9.0)

Note: Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

### Socio Economic Profile of Respondents

Table 3 elaborated that out of total sample maximum percentage of respondents (46%) belonged to the general caste followed by an equal number of percentages of backward caste (27%) and schedule caste (27%). The data further pinpointed that 40 percent rural respondents belonged to schedule caste where as 64 percent urban respondents belonged to general caste. A cursory look at the table rendered that 71.5 percent respondents of the total sample were nuclear in structure followed by 28.5 percent respondents were having joint family structure. Almost similar trends were portrayed for rural and urban sample (69.0% and 74.0%, respectively) that majority belonged to the nuclear family structure, pointing towards the breakup of joint family system. A cursory look at the table rendered that in total sample, 63 percent of the respondents had small sized family followed by 37 percent large sized families. Further probing of data envisaged that 56 percent were small sized in rural families, whereas, 70 percent families were small sized in urban areas.

**Table 3: Socio Economic Profile of Respondents on the Basis of Area**

Sr. No.	Socio Economic Variables	Rural N= 100	Urban N=100	Total N=200
<b>1.</b>	<b>Caste</b>			
	Schedule caste	40 (40.0)	14 (14.0)	54 (27.0)
	Backward class	32 (32.0)	22 (22.0)	54 (27.0)
	General	28 (28.0)	64 (64.0)	92 (46.0)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Family type</b>			
	Nuclear	69 (69.0)	74 (74.0)	143 (71.5)
	Joint	31 (31.0)	26 (26.0)	57 (28.5)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Family size</b>			
	Small (up to 5 members)	56 (56.0)	70 (70.0)	126 (63.0)
	Large (6 and above)	44 (44.0)	30 (30.0)	74 (37.0)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Number of siblings</b>			
	1 to 2 siblings	83 (83.0)	91 (91.0)	174 (87.0)
	3 to 4 siblings	17 (17.0)	9 (9.0)	26 (13.0)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Annual income of family</b>			
	Low	27 (27.0)	10 (10.0)	37 (18.5)
	Middle	58 (58.0)	16 (16.0)	74 (37.0)
	High	15 (15.0)	74 (74.0)	89 (44.5)

Note: Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

It is corroborated from the data majority of the respondents of rural families (83%), urban families (91%) and as well as total sample (87%) had 1-2 siblings in their families followed by 3-4 siblings. Perusal of results further showed that data pertaining to economic status confirmed that the majority of urban respondents (74%) and total sample (44.5%) had high income group followed by middle and lower income group, whereas rural respondents, where higher percentage, i.e. 58 percent respondents of rural area belonged to middle income group followed by low (27 %) and high income group (15 %).

Summarizing the personal profile of the respondents, parents and socioeconomic profile it can be interpreted that a higher percentage (80%) of respondents were in 16-17 years of age, having birth order in category 1-2 and had a 2nd division in academic achievement. Regarding the parental profile of respondents it can be concluded that the majority of fathers had age between 35-45 years and mothers were 30-40 years. Mother of respondents had poor educational status as majority of them were below 10<sup>th</sup> standard or illiterate, whereas, the majority of fathers had education between 10<sup>th</sup> -12<sup>th</sup> standard. Further, in total sample almost half of the respondent's fathers were engaged in farming and majority of mothers were housewives, whereas, the majority of the fathers were engaged in job in urban areas. Further probing of data indicated that the majority of the families were having a nuclear family system small sized family with 1-2 siblings. The majority of urban respondents belong to general caste, with higher family income more, in comparison, the majority of rural respondents belonged to schedule caste having middle income in their families.

### **Attitude of Respondents towards Modernization**

Data portrayed in table 4 highlighted the results related to the frequency distribution of respondents to various aspects of modernization on the basis of the area as well as total sample.

**Table 4: Attitude of Respondents towards Modernization on the Basis of Area**

Sr. No.	Aspects of Modernization	Rural N = 100	Urban N = 100	Total N =200
<b>1.</b>	<b>Education</b>			
	Low (7-16)	12 (12.0)	10 (10.0)	22 (11.0)
	Average (17-26)	57 (57.0)	33 (33.0)	90 (45.0)
	High (27-36)	31 (31.0)	57 (57.0)	88 (44.0)
<b>ii.</b>	<b>Parent-child relationship</b>			
	Low (7-16)	17 (17.0)	13 (13.0)	30 (15.0)
	Average (17-26)	60 (60.0)	18 (18.0)	78 (39.0)
	High (27-36)	23 (23.0)	69 (69.0)	92 (46.0)
<b>iii.</b>	<b>Politics</b>			
	Low (7-16)	20 (20.0)	18 (18.0)	38 (19.0)
	Average (17-26)	64 (64.0)	60 (60.0)	124 (62.0)
	High (27-36)	16(16.0)	22 (22.0)	38 (19.0)
<b>iv.</b>	<b>Status of women</b>			
	Low (7-16)	15 (15.0)	08 (08.0)	23 (11.5)
	Average (17-26)	49 (49.0)	37 (37.0)	86 (43.0)
	High (27-36)	36 (36.0)	55 (55.0)	91 (45.5)
	<b>Marriage</b>			
<b>v.</b>	Low (7-16)	09 (09.0)	17 (17.0)	26 (13.0)
	Average (17-26)	51 (51.0)	52 (52.0)	103 (51.5)
	High (27-36)	40 (40.0)	31 (31.0)	71 (35.5)
	<b>Religion</b>			
<b>vi.</b>	Low (7-16)	11 (11.0)	20 (20.0)	31 (15.5)
	Average (17-26)	70 (70.0)	63 (63.0)	133 (66.5)
	High (27-36)	19 (19.0)	17 (17.0)	36 (18.0)
	<b>Socio cultural factors</b>			
<b>Vii.</b>	Low (7-16)	14 (14.0)	17 (17.0)	31 (15.5)
	Average (17-26)	67 (67.0)	74 (74.0)	141 (70.5)
	High (27-36)	19 (19.0)	9 (9.0)	28 (14.0)

Note: Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

It was observed that urban respondents had more positive attitudes on education (57%), parent child relationship (69%), politics (22%) and status of women (55%) aspects of modernization as compared to their counterparts (education 31%, parent child relationship 23%, politics 16% and status of women 49%). Further probing of data highlighted that urban respondents had the maximum positive attitude of average level of marriage (52%), and social cultural factors (74%) aspects of modernization while comparing with rural respondents. The data further explained that rural respondents had the maximum positive attitude of average level of politics (64%), religion (70%). The data pertaining to the total sample envisaged that maximum respondents had an average level of attitude towards modernization of education (45%), politics (62%), and status of women (43%), marriage (51.5%), religion (66.5%) and social cultural factors (70.5%) except parent-child relationship aspect on which they had high level attitude (46%).

#### **Mean Comparison in Attitude of Respondents towards Modernization**

Results related to the comparison of mean scores of modernization on the basis of locality are depicted in table 5. Significant differences were observed on education ( $Z=4.14^*$ ), parent-child relationship ( $Z=3.9^*$ ) and status of women ( $Z=2.01^*$ ),  $p \leq 0.05$ . Further examined of scores revealed urban respondents are more positive towards education ( $M=28.47$ ), P-C relationship ( $M=25.09$ ) and status of women ( $M=22.26$ ) as compared to rural respondents ( $M=26.20$ ,  $M=23.54$ ,  $M=20.91$  respectively). It means locality also had effects on the attitude of adolescent towards modernization.

**Table 5: Comparison in Attitude of Respondents Towards Modernization on the Basis of Area**

Sr. No.	Aspects of Modernization	Rural Mean +SD	Urban Mean+ SD	Z-Value
i.	Education	26.20±4.27	28.47±3.44	4.14*
ii.	Parent-child relationship	23.54±3.40	25.09±3.00	3.89*
iii.	Politics	29.35±3.81	29.20±3.23	0.29
iv.	Status of women	20.91±3.80	22.26±2.91	2.01*
v.	Marriage	25.35±3.37	25.21±3.35	0.28
vi.	Religion	26.604±.31	26.65±4.65	0.07
vii.	Socio-cultural factors	24.83±2.72	23.89±3.29	1.67

\*Significant at 5% level of significance

The result indicated that urban adolescents had a better attitude towards education, parent child relationship, politics and the status of women aspects of modernization as compared to rural respondents. Comparatively also results highlighted that significant mean differences were observed in rural and urban. This may be due to the reason that children of urban area had more exposure, better facilities and parental care. These findings are similar to previous findings of Zhang et al., (2003) and Desetty and Agarwal (2004) who reported significant difference in individual modernity between the students from the town and those from the countryside. Further result related to mean comparison of respondents on the attitude of adolescent towards modernization indicated that urban respondents are more positive towards education ( $M=28.47$ ), P-C relationship ( $M=25.09$ ) and status of women ( $M=22.26$ ) as compared to rural respondents ( $M=26.20$ ,  $M=23.54$ ,  $M=20.91$  respectively). The finding of Chaudhary (2012) also strengthens the present study concluded that the attitudes of urban B.Ed. Trainees were founded higher than those of rural B.Ed. Trainees.

## CONCLUSIONS

The present study indicated that urban adolescents had a better attitude towards modernization as compared to rural adolescents on the basis of locality. The urban adolescents had more positive attitudes towards education, parent child relationship, politics and the status of women aspects of modernization as compared to rural respondents. Comparatively also results highlighted that significant mean differences were observed in rural and urban. This may be due to the reason that children of urban area had more exposure, better facilities of the internet and parental care with higher income.

## REFERENES

1. Ahluwalia, S. P. and Kalia, A. (1998). *Comprehensive modernization inventory*. National Psychological Corporation, 4/230, Kacheri Ghat, Agra.
2. Chaudhary, A. 2012. *A study of attitudes of B.Ed. trainees towards modernization*. *International Indexed and Referred Research Journal*, **I**: 20-91.
3. Chaudhary A (2017), *A Study of Modernisation among Indian Youths across Gender & Religions*, *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 4, Issue 2, No. 86,
4. Desetty, R. and Agrawal, M. 2004. *Association between modernisation of the college girls and their family background variable*. *Indian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 41:25-29.
5. Haviland. A, 2002. *Cultural Anthropology*. 10<sup>th</sup> edition. Harcourt Collage Publishers. USA. P. 423.
6. Kragh, S. U. and Djursaa, M. 2006. *Modernization and management: Business school teaching across countries*. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, **6** (1): 19-36.

7. Zhang, X. 2003. *Comparative research on individual modernity of adolescents between town and countryside in China*, *Asian Journal Of Psychology*, South China Normal University, Guangzhou.